

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO
031432.000247

PATENT
U.S. 10/792,095

Remarks/ Arguments

In response to the Office Action mailed June 6, 2005, Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the objections to the specification and the claims.

Claim 1 remains.

Claim 1 is being amended.

Claims 2 – 15 are being added.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Holland* (U.S. Patent 5,813,602) (hereinafter "*Holland reference*"), in further view of *Raymond* (U.S. Patent 4,793,545) (hereinafter "*Raymond reference*"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

As the Examiner correctly admits, the *Holland reference* does not teach or suggest a thin layer of ultra high molecular weight polyethylene material. Applicant adds, that with respect to new Claims 2 and 10, the *Holland reference* also does not disclose or suggest the provision of a void within a pliable base member, which advantageously provides a shock absorbing function.

These differences are not remedied by the teachings of the *Raymond reference*. In particular, the *Raymond reference* does not disclose the utilization of a thin layer of ultra high molecular weight material as a liner, nor considers the advantages of using such a liner. Among the significant advantages to using a thin strip of ultra high molecular weight material, are hardness, flexibility, and decreased friction. In contrast, the *Raymond reference* only discloses a relatively thick elastomeric member 106. (Col. 5, Lines 55 – 64). The elastomeric (rubber-like) characteristics of member 106 will result in wear over time and a loss of thickness. Moreover, the relative thickness of elastomeric member 106 limits its flexibility and ability to absorb shock.

With respect to Claims 2 and 10, the *Raymond reference* also does not teach or suggest creation of a void within a pliable base member.

031432 000247 DALLAS 1932969.1

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO
031432.000247

PATENT
U.S. 10/792,095

Given that neither *Holland* nor the *Raymond* references, either above or in combination, discloses or suggests the use of an ultra high molecular weight liner, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 1 as obvious in view of the *Holland* and *Raymond* references should be withdrawn.

No new matter has been added; the claims have been merely amended to more particularly claim the subject matter Applicant believes is inventive. Applicant respectfully submits that the Claims as they now stand are patentably distinct over the art cited during the prosecution thereof.

Applicant respectfully requests a First Month Extension of Time to File this Response. Enclosed with this paper is Form PTO/SB/22 with Extension Fees in the amount of \$120.

With the addition the new claims, no additional filing fees are due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 20-0821 of Thompson & Knight LLP.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this paper or the present application in general, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (214) 969 - 1749.

Respectfully submitted,

Thompson & Knight LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By:


James J. Murphy
Reg. No. 34,503

1700 Pacific Avenue
Suite 3300
Dallas TX. 75201 - 4693
Date: September 16 , 2005

031432 000247 DALLAS 1932969.1